

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Number	:	09/884,467	Confirmation No.:	9623
Appellant	:	Jeffrey A. Bedell		
Filed	:	June 20, 2001		
Title	:	System and Method for Analyzing Statistics in a Reporting System		
TC/Art Unit	:	2167		
Examiner:	:	Luke S. WASSUM		
Docket No.	:	53470.003030		
Customer No.	:	21967		

APPEAL BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	1
II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.....	1
III. STATUS OF CLAIMS.....	1
IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	2
V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER	2
A. Concise explanation of Independent Claim 1	2
B. Concise explanation of Dependent Claim 9	3
C. Concise explanation of Independent Claim 10	3
D. Concise explanation of Dependent Claim 18	4
E. Concise explanation of Independent Claim 19	4
F. Concise explanation of Dependent Claim 27	5
VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....	5
VII. ARGUMENT	6
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	14
IX. CLAIMS APPENDIX	15
X. EVIDENCE APPENDIX	21
XI. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX.....	22

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Number : 09/884,467 Confirmation No.: 9623
Appellant : Jeffrey A. Bedell
Filed : June 20, 2001
Title : System and Method for Analyzing Statistics in a Reporting System
TC/Art Unit : 2167
Examiner: : Luke S. WASSUM
Docket No. : 53470.003030
Customer No. : **21967**

APPEAL BRIEF

In response to the Office Action dated August 2, 2007, rejecting pending claims 1-29 and objecting to claim 30, Appellants respectfully request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reconsider and withdraw the rejections of record, which are attached hereto as an Appendix.

I. Real Party In Interest

The real party in interest is MicroStrategy, Incorporated as assignee of the entire interest in the above-referenced application, assigned by its inventors.

II. Related Appeals And Interferences

There are no known related appeals.

III. Status Of Claims

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-26 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by IBM ("The Business Intelligence Infrastructure on S/390 Accessing DB2 on OS/390") ("IBM") as evidenced by Hahn et al. ("Capacity Planning for Business Intelligence

Applications: Approaches and Methodologies”) (“Hahn”) and IBM[1] (“OS/390 Resource Measurement Facility Report Analysis”) (“IBM1”).

Claims 9, 18, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over IBM as evidenced by Hahn and IBM1, in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0046204 to Hayes (“Hayes”).

Claim 30 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

The final rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112, 102(a) and 103(a) is appealed.

IV. Status Of Amendments

No amendments to the claims have been filed after the last rejection.

V. Summary Of Claimed Subject Matter

A concise explanation of independent claims 1, 10, and 19, as well as dependent claims 9, 18 and 27 is reproduced below, along with a citation to page number, line number, figures, and reference characters, where appropriate, to assist the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (“Board”) in appreciating the significant advances made by the embodiments of the present invention.

A. Concise Explanation of Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method for capturing at least one statistic or data regarding performance operation of a business intelligence reporting system that generates business intelligence reports based on requests submitted to perform analysis of data contained in a database, the method comprising the steps of: (*See, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 2, ll. 2-10 and p. 16, l. 20 - p.17, l. 12*)

gathering at least one statistic or data related to the performance operation of the reporting system while the reporting system is operating; (*See*, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 2, ll. 16-17, p. 12, ll. 13 - 16 and p. 16, ll. 7-15)

analyzing the at least one statistic or data; and (*See*, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 2, ll. 14-16 and p. 12, l. 17 - p. 13, l. 16)

generating at least one output based on the gathered at least one statistic or data, wherein the at least one output includes an alert if the analysis of the at least one statistic or data indicates that a condition has occurred. (*See*, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 3, ll. 16 - 20, p. 12, l. 22 - p.13, l. 2 and p. 16, ll. 7 - 15).

B. Concise Explanation of Dependent Claim 9

Claim 9 recites a computer-implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of performing automated tuning of the reporting system based on the at least one output. (*See*, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 11, ll. 15-19, p. 13, ll. 13-16, and claims 9, 18 and 27 as originally filed).

C. Concise Explanation of Independent Claim 10

Claim 10 recites a system for capturing at least one statistic or data regarding performance operation of a business intelligence report system that generates business intelligence reports based on requests submitted to perform analysis of data contained in a database, the system comprising: (*See*, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 2, ll. 2-10 and p. 16, l. 20 - p.17, l. 12)

gathering means for gathering at least one statistic or data related to the operation of the reporting system while the reporting system is operating; (*See*, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 2, ll. 16 -17, p. 12, ll. 13 - 16 and p. 16, ll. 7-15)

analyzing means for analyzing the at least one statistic or data; and (*See*, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 2, ll. 14-16 and p. 12, l. 17 - p. 13, l. 16)

generating means for generating at least one output based on the gathered at least one statistic or data, wherein the at least one output includes an alert if the analyzing means indicates that a condition has occurred based on the analysis of the at least one statistic or data. (*See*, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 3, ll. 16 - 20, p. 12, l. 22 - p.13, l. 2 and p. 16, ll. 7 - 15).

D. Concise Explanation of Dependent Claim 18

Claim 18 recites a system according to claim 10, further comprising means for performing automated tuning of the reporting system based on the at least one output. (*See*, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 11, ll. 15-19, p. 13, ll. 13-16, and claims 9, 18 and 27 as originally filed).

E. Concise Explanation of Independent Claim 19

Claim 19 recites a medium storing code for causing a processor to capture at least one statistic or data regarding performance operation of a business intelligence reporting system that generates business intelligence reports based on requests submitted to perform analysis of data contained in a database, the medium comprising: (*See*, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 2, ll. 2-10 and p. 16, l. 20 - p.17, l. 12)

code for causing a processor to gather at least one statistic or data related to the operation of the reporting system while the reporting system is operating; (*See*, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 2, ll. 16 -17, p. 12, ll. 13 - 16 and p. 16, ll. 7-15)

code for causing a processor to analyze the at least one statistic or data; and (*See*, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 2, ll. 14-16 and p. 12, l. 17 - p. 13, l. 16)

code for causing a processor to generate at least one output based on the gathered at least one statistic or data, wherein the at least one output includes an alert if the code for causing a

processor to analyze the at least one statistic or data indicates that a condition has occurred. (See, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 3, ll. 16 - 20, p. 12, l. 22 - p.13, l. 2 and p. 16, ll. 7 - 15).

F. Concise Explanation of Dependent Claim 27

Claim 27 recites a medium according to claim 19, further comprising code for causing the processor to automatically tune the reporting system based on the at least one output. (See, for example, FIGs. 1, 3, p. 11, ll. 15-19, p. 13, ll. 13-16, and claims 9, 18 and 27 as originally filed).

VI. Grounds Of Rejection To Be Reviewed On Appeal

The following grounds of rejection are to be reviewed on appeal:

- The rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.
- The rejection of claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-26 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by IBM ("The Business Intelligence Infrastructure on S/390 Accessing DB2 on OS/390") ("IBM") as evidenced by Hahn et al. ("Capacity Planning for Business Intelligence Applications: Approaches and Methodologies") ("Hahn") and IBM[1] ("OS/390 Resource Measurement Facility Report Analysis") ("IBM1").
- The rejection of claims 9, 18, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over IBM as evidenced by Hahn and IBM1, in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0046204 to Hayes ("Hayes").

VII. Argument

The Office has failed to show: (1) there is a lack of written description for the claims, (2) that the claims are anticipated and (3) that the claims are obvious. Each of the specific claims and the impropriety of the rejections is addressed below.

A. Rejection of Claim 28 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description. This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claim 28 recites “[t]he computer-implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising categorizing the at least one statistic or data into one of a plurality of groups to configure a frequency of gathering the at least one statistic or data.” The Examiner asserts that “the use of categorized statistics in order to configure the frequency does not appear to be disclosed.” *See* Action, pg. 3. Appellants note that support for the configuration as recited in claim 28 is found on page 15, lines 17-18 of the specification which recite “[t]he amount of statistics logging may be configurable ...[and] [s]tatistics can be categorized into groups to enable configuration.” Additionally, the specification provides that time periods may be used for the logging of statistics. For example, the specification recites “[a]ccording to an embodiment of the invention, in order to provide the real-time alert reporting to an administrator, statistics may be logged within a specified time period (e.g., 5 minutes) of collection time. **Other time periods may also be used.**” Pg. 16, lines 7-9, (emphasis added). In addition, on page 16, line 20 - page 17, line 2, the specification also provides that statistics may be defined by a server for various

categories of information:

According to an embodiment of the invention, for the statistics to be meaningful, the processing that a server performs may be defined for an end user of the statistics. For purposes of collecting statistics, various categories of information may be tracked, including user sessions, metadata object requests, element browse requests, report execution requests, and document execution requests. Other categories may also be used.

Pg. 16, line 20 - page 17, line 2. Appellants note that as disclosed by the specification, time periods may be specified to configure the gathering of statistics. Examples of the usage of periodic statistics exist throughout the specification. User requests may specify periods of data required for reports. For example, “[p]redetermined requests may include, but are not limited to, the top ten reports most provided to subscribers, web access trends, **peak time periods**, and job time-out reviews.” Page 12, lines 7-9, emphasis added. Monitoring reporting system usage may also utilize periodic statistics. “Indicating application usage may include indicating report and/or document usage, user activity, such as drill-downs and prompts, user access patterns (*e.g.*, time of day, day of month, etc.), billing functions, such as system resources used by a user and other usage.” Page 13, lines 17-19.

Furthermore, categories of information may be tracked and the processing that a server performs may be defined for an end user of the statistics. If a category is tracked that includes requests or other tracked items that occur periodically, the gathering of the statistics would be defined periodically in order to gather the statistic within the time period it occurred.

The specification of the present application also incorporates U.S. Patent No. 6,154,766 to Yost *et al.* (“Yost”) by reference. *See* page 5, lines 7-8. Yost provides detailed information on how a user may schedule the periodic running of a service which utilizes data. Yost explains a service includes “one or more reports that are scheduled to be run against one or more data warehouses, relational databases, files in a directory, information from a web or file transfer

protocol site, or information provided by a custom module, by a server system.” Column 4, lines 12-16. Yost further details “the user selects the schedule for the service. ... [which] may be run on a several-minute, hourly, daily, monthly, semi-annual or annual basis, all depending upon what frequency is desired.” *See*, Column 11, lines 36-44. Clearly there is support in the specification for the periodic gathering of data.

Additionally, as stated in MPEP § 2163.02, the fundamental factual inquiry is whether a claim defines an invention that is clearly conveyed to those skilled in the art at the time the application was filed. The subject matter of the claim need not be described literally (i.e., using the same terms or in *haec verba*) in order for the disclosure to satisfy the description requirement.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned written description rejection of claim 28 be withdrawn.

B. Rejection of Claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-26 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by IBM (“The Business Intelligence Infrastructure on S/390 Accessing DB2 on OS/390”) (“IBM”) as evidenced by Hahn et al. (“Capacity Planning for Business Intelligence Applications: Approaches and Methodologies”) (“Hahn”) and IBM[1] (“OS/390 Resource Measurement Facility Report Analysis”) (“IBM1”).

The independent claims 1, 10 and 19 recite “gather[ing] at least one statistic or data related to the performance operation of the reporting system while the reporting system is operating.” Appellants note that there appears to be a misunderstanding of the claimed invention based on the references applied in the Action. Appellants provide the following example excerpted from the Application to further explain exemplary embodiments of the invention.

Page 2, lines 2-8 of the instant application, for example, provides an exemplary embodiment that may describe various features recited in the claims. These lines recite:

The invention relates to a system and method for capturing and analyzing statistics or data related to operation of a report system. A report system provides informational and transactional content, in the form of a report, to a user (also referred to as a subscriber), such as via a web posting, e-mail, voice and other channels. ... The captured statistics or data enables analysis of the report execution, as well as analysis of the report system itself and its performance.

(Emphasis added.) Thus, these lines describe capturing statistics or data related to operation and/or performance of a report system. The references, as cited, are not related to capturing statistics or data related to operation and/or performance of a report system. Specifically IBM as cited discloses, at most, “measures of system resources utilized; for instance, CPU time, storage, I/O devices, and service units...” See Office Action, pages 4-5. IBM is not cited for disclosure of “gathering at least one statistic or data related to the performance operation of the reporting system while the reporting system is operating.” IBM does not disclose gathering statistics of a reporting system, such as statistics on user sessions, metadata object requests, element browse requests, report execution requests, and document execution requests or other reporting system related statistics. As is known to a person of ordinary skill in the art, it is quite possible to have poor performance on a report while the underlying operating system, such as OS/390, is performing well and has low utilization. A report system typically sits on top of an operating system. Allegedly gathering, analyzing or reporting on statistics of an operating system does not anticipate “gathering at least one statistic or data related to the performance operation of the reporting system while the reporting system is operating.” In this case and in other cases, it is quite evident that an alleged disclosure of operating system statistics is not a disclosure of reporting system statistics.

Furthermore, Hahn fails to cure the above deficiencies. The cited portions of Hahn are again directed, at most, to the alleged tracking of operating system statistics. For example, CPU time, storage, I/O Devices and service units are tracked. *See*, Hahn, pages 65-66. These are clearly operating system statistics and not reporting system statistics. An operating system is not a reporting system.

Additionally, the system management facility reports of Hahn relied upon by the Examiner, appear to be run as a default part of the operating system. “The OS/390 operating system includes the Systems Management Facility (SMF), which helps you measure various aspects of work running in the system.” IBM, page 65, section 5.1.1. A process run as a default part of the operating system does not teach or disclose “capturing at least one statistic or data regarding performance operation of a business intelligence reporting system that generates business intelligence reports **based on requests submitted to perform analysis of data.**” IBM, at most, suggests the default continual running of SMF processes to analyze data. A process which runs automatically as part of the operating system to capture data is not a teaching or suggestion of “capturing at least one statistic or data regarding performance operation of a business intelligence reporting system” which is based upon “requests submitted to perform analysis of data.” A process running as an O/S default process is not run in response to a request to perform analysis.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, the Appellants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a).

C. Rejection of Claims 9, 18, and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9, 18, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over IBM as evidenced by Hahn and IBM1, in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0046204 to Hayes ("Hayes").

IBM and Hahn do not teach or suggest tuning a report system. IBM and Hahn, as discussed above, are directed towards operating systems. An operating system is, at most, a platform for a report system. In fact, a report system may utilize multiple components running on top of multiple operating systems. For example, the specification states that the system may

include or interface to or be supported by computing resources, such as one or more associated servers ...[which] may include ... a workstation running a Microsoft Windows™ NT operating system, a Windows™ 2000 operating system, an IBM AIX™ operating system, a Hewlett-Packard UX™ operating system, a Novell Netware™ operating system, a Sun Microsystems Solaris™ operating system, an OS/2™ operating system, a BeOS™ operating system, a Macintosh operating system, an Apache platform, an OpenStep™ operating system, or another similar operating system or platform.

Page 6, lines 11-16. Thus even if one operating system failed completely a report may complete utilizing resources of other servers. Conversely, if one or even all operating systems were tuned, this may not address issues of a report system which may have one or more components above or separate from an operating system.

Hayes fails to cure deficiencies of IBM, IBM1 and Hahn as discussed above. Hayes is directed to "a method for automating **database bufferpool tuning** for optimized performance that employs certain heuristic algorithms." Abstract, emphasis added. As such, Hayes is not

directed towards “gathering at least one statistic or data related to the performance operation of the reporting system while the reporting system is operating.”

Furthermore, Appellants believe claims 9, 18, and 27 are separately patentable at least because there is no disclosure of “performing automated tuning of the reporting system based on the at least one output.” The Examiner in this rejection continues to repeat a critical mistake. An operation performed on a reporting system, such as “performing automated tuning of the reporting system based on the at least one output” is not disclosed by an alleged operation on a lower level process such as an operating system or database cache. Appellants note that database bufferpool tuning is applicable to only databases which have bufferpools. Not all databases may have bufferpools and tuning a bufferpool may not address many or even any issues of a report system. At best, a database may be a component of a platform under a report system and a bufferpool may be a component of a database. For example, a database may be an object oriented database, a flat file based database or another type of database which may not contain or utilize a bufferpool. Again the alleged tuning of a **possible** small component of a platform underlying or supporting a system does not teach or suggest the automated tuning of the system itself. Thus, Hayes fails to disclose the automated tuning of a reporting system.

As stated in MPEP § 2143.03, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). That is, “[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Additionally, claim 9 recites “automated tuning of the reporting system [is] based upon at least one output” wherein the output is based on requests submitted to perform analysis of

data. Claims 18 and 27 have similar limitations. The alleged automated tuning of Hayes is not based upon an output which is “based on requests submitted to perform analysis of data.” Hayes makes no disclosure, teaching or suggestion of an output based on requests submitted to perform analysis. In fact, Hayes teaches away from basing automated tuning based on an output which is “based on requests submitted to perform analysis of data.” Hayes states “[t]he entire method can be coded in machine language and automated; minimal intervention from administration staff is required thus freeing these valuable resources for other business objectives.” Hayes, paragraph 92, lines 16-19. Thus, Hayes would run an alleged automated tuning process continually and not in response to a user request. To modify Hayes to require a user input would defeat a primary purpose of Hayes.

As stated in MPEP § 2143.01, if the proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Further, if the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims prima facie obvious. In re Ratti, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959).

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, the Appellants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9, 18, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

VIII. Conclusion

Because the cited reference fails to disclose or render obvious all features set forth in the pending claims, Appellants submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the Board reverse the prior art rejections set forth in the Action, and allow all of the pending claims. Authorization is hereby granted to charge or credit the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206 for any fees or overpayments related to the entry of this Appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Dec 7, 2007

By: BMB
Brian M. Buroker
Registration No. 39,125

Hunton & Williams
1900 K. St., NW, Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
(202) 955-1894

IX. Claims Appendix

1. A computer-implemented method for capturing at least one statistic or data regarding performance operation of a business intelligence reporting system that generates business intelligence reports based on requests submitted to perform analysis of data contained in a database, the method comprising the steps of:

gathering at least one statistic or data related to the performance operation of the reporting system while the reporting system is operating;

analyzing the at least one statistic or data; and

generating at least one output based on the gathered at least one statistic or data, wherein the at least one output includes an alert if the analysis of the at least one statistic or data indicates that a condition has occurred.

2. The computer-implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of providing the output to an end user.

3. The computer-implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of storing the at least one gathered statistic or data in a database accessible by the reporting system for generating reports utilizing the gathered statistic or data.

4. The computer-implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of providing the output to an end user in real-time, enabling the end user to analyze the reporting system in real-time.

5. The computer-implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of analyzing the output, where analyzing the output comprises using at least one of:

a) a decision support technique; and

b) a decision support software.

6. The computer-implemented method according to claim 1, where the at least one statistic or data is related to at least one of:

- a) metadata usage;
- b) server data;
- c) concurrency data;
- d) overall system usage;
- e) individual user activity;
- f) report usage data;
- g) report definition data;
- h) standard query language data;
- i) object usage data; and
- j) database usage data.

7. The computer-implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of allocating costs of reporting system usage to a user of the reporting system based on the at least one output.

8. The computer-implemented method according to claim 1, wherein the reporting system is an OLAP system.

9. The computer-implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of performing automated tuning of the reporting system based on the at least one output.

10. A system for capturing at least one statistic or data regarding performance operation of a business intelligence report system that generates business intelligence reports

based on requests submitted to perform analysis of data contained in a database, the system comprising:

gathering means for gathering at least one statistic or data related to the operation of the reporting system while the reporting system is operating;

analyzing means for analyzing the at least one statistic or data; and

generating means for generating at least one output based on the gathered at least one statistic or data, wherein the at least one output includes an alert if the analyzing means indicates that a condition has occurred based on the analysis of the at least one statistic or data.

11. The system according to claim 10, further comprising transmission means for providing the output to an end user.

12. The system according to claim 10, further comprising storage means for storing the at least one gathered statistic or data in a database accessible by the reporting system for generating reports utilizing the gathered statistic or data.

13. The system according to claim 10, further comprising transmission means for providing the output to an end user in real-time, enabling the end user to analyze the reporting system in real-time.

14. The system according to claim 10, further comprising processor means for analyzing the output, where analyzing the output comprises using at least one of:

- a) a decision support technique; and
- b) a decision support software.

15. The system according to claim 10, where the at least one statistic or data is related to at least one of:

- a) metadata usage;

- b) server data;
- c) concurrency data;
- d) overall system usage;
- e) individual user activity;
- f) report usage data;
- g) report definition data;
- h) standard query language data;
- i) object usage data; and
- j) database usage data.

16. The system according to claim 10, further comprising means for allocating costs of reporting system usage to a user of the reporting system based on the at least one output.

17. The system according to claim 10, wherein the reporting system is an OLAP system.

18. The system according to claim 10, further comprising means for performing automated tuning of the reporting system based on the at least one output.

19. A medium storing code for causing a processor to capture at least one statistic or data regarding performance operation of a business intelligence reporting system that generates business intelligence reports based on requests submitted to perform analysis of data contained in a database, the medium comprising:

code for causing a processor to gather at least one statistic or data related to the operation of the reporting system while the reporting system is operating;

code for causing a processor to analyze the at least one statistic or data; and

code for causing a processor to generate at least one output based on the gathered at least one statistic or data, wherein the at least one output includes an alert if the code for causing a processor to analyze the at least one statistic or data indicates that a condition has occurred.

20. The medium according to claim 19, further comprising code for causing a processor to provide the output to an end user.

21. The medium according to claim 19, further comprising code for causing the processor to store the at least one gathered statistic or data in a database accessible by the reporting system for generating reports utilizing the gathered statistic or data.

22. The medium according to claim 19, further comprising code for causing the processor to provide the output to an end user in real-time, enabling the end user to analyze the reporting system in real-time.

23. The medium according to claim 19, further comprising code for causing the processor to analyze the output, where analyzing the output comprises using at least one of:

- a) a decision support technique; and
- b) a decision support software.

24. The medium according to claim 19, where the at least one statistic or data is related to at least one of:

- a) metadata usage;
- b) server data;
- c) concurrency data;
- d) overall system usage;
- e) individual user activity;
- f) report usage data;

- g) report definition data;
- h) standard query language data;
- i) object usage data; and
- j) database usage data.

25. The medium according to claim 19, further comprising code for causing the processor to allocate costs of reporting system usage to a user of the reporting system based on the at least one output.

26. The medium according to claim 19, wherein the reporting system is an OLAP system.

27. The medium according to claim 19, further comprising code for causing the processor to automatically tune the reporting system based on the at least one output.

28. The computer-implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising categorizing the at least one statistic or data into one of a plurality of groups to configure a frequency of gathering the at least one statistic or data.

29. The computer-implemented method according to claim 1, wherein the at least one statistic or data is gathered to monitor processing of a cache request.

30. The computer-implemented method according to claim 1, wherein executing the requests results in two statistics records for the requests containing prompts.

X. Evidence Appendix

None.

XI. Related Proceedings Appendix

None.